

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are currently pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 8 are amended and claims 9 and 10 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Additionally, Applicants have added new claims 11-14 for consideration by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendment(s) and added claims may be found at least at pages 5-7 of the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Preliminary Matters

Applicants believe that no extensions of time are required at this time. If extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned for under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Applicants believe that no further fees for net addition of claims are required at this time. Any fees required for extensions of time and any fees for the net addition of claims are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 23-1951.

Furthermore, Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's consideration of the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed in the present application on December 8, 2003 by the return of the initialed and signed copy of the PTO-1449 Form accompanying the Information Disclosure Statement.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's acceptance of the drawings filed December 8, 2003.

Applicants further note with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgment of Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and the receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

Claim objections

In the Office Action, claims 4 and 8 were objected to for minor informalities. Accordingly, the word "each" has been added to each of claims 4 and 8 to address the Examiner's concerns. Support for the amendment is found on page 8, lines 12-14 of the instant application. This amendment is not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended. Therefore, Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by this amendment.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 and 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,391,137, issued to Matsushima ("the Matsushima reference"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner has failed to establish a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because the Matsushima reference fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. The Matsushima reference is cited by the Examiner for disclosing a method of manufacturing a flat panel display comprising the elements of independent claim 1 and the elements of independent claim 5. The Matsushima reference is inadequate as an anticipatory reference because it fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Specifically, for example, nowhere does the Matsushima reference teach or suggest, *inter alia*, combining the upper substrate and the lower substrate together so that the image display devices are individually *sealed up* as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 5. Additionally, nowhere

does the Matsushima reference teach or suggest, inter alia, *cutting* the combined upper and lower substrates in units as recited in independent claim 1.

In this regard, contrary to the present invention and to the Examiner's reference to column 1, lines 50-54 & lines 64-67 of Matsushima, Matsushima merely teaches leaving an injection hole 3a in the sealing material (column 2, lines 1-9). Subsequently, Matsushima etches the glass substrates 1, 2 (as described in the paragraph bridging columns 2 and 3) and then injects the liquid crystal material (column 3, lines 6-10) after the etching process.

Contrary to the Examiner's indication that Matsushima discloses cutting in column 3, lines 1-5, Matsushima merely indicates that the glass substrates are divided. In this regard, there is no apparent teaching or suggestion in Matsushima of cutting the substrates.

Because the applied reference of Matsushima fails to disclose each and every element recited in independent claims 1 and 5, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection of anticipation.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-8. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 5, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Matsushima reference. Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants note that claim 4 depends from allowable claim 1, and as such, includes all the elements thereof. Because claim 1 recites at least one novel element (e.g., combining the upper substrate and the lower substrate together so that the image display devices are

individually *sealed up*) not disclosed in the Matsushima, claim 4 is accordingly allowable.

Moreover, claim 4 recites additional features including, *inter alia*, the upper and lower substrates are etched so that the upper substrate and the lower substrate each have a total thickness of at most 0.5mm, not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection and pass claim 4 to issue.

Minor amendments

Additionally, minor amendments have been made to claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 8 in order to improve the language thereof. In these amendments, Applicants have made several changes to the language of the claims to render the same more self consistent, as well as more fully in compliance with U.S. syntax, idiom and grammar. These amendments do not change the scope of the claims but are merely cosmetic changes that give rise to no file wrapper estoppel.

New Claims

New claims 11-14 add no prohibited new matter and are submitted to be allowable. They find support in the specification at, *inter alia*, pages 7 and 8.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response; the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued for this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: **March 14, 2005**

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280

\\COM\483900.2